

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

10 RAFAEL RIVERA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WILLIAM J MCGAFFEY, ROZELL
14 TOWNSEND, LINDA ALLEN,
DUNINGTON, K ARLOW, DOUG
15 WADDINGTON,

16 Defendant.

CASE NO. C11-5942-RJB-KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
DISCOVERY CONFERENCE AS
MOOT

17 Before the Court is Plaintiffs Motion for a Discovery Conference. ECF No. 31. Plaintiff
18 requests that counsel for Defendants arrange a telephonic discovery conference as soon as
19 possible. *Id.* Defendants advise that the parties held a discovery conference by telephone on
20 May 31, 2012. Counsel for Defendants have advised Plaintiff that requests for discovery
21 conference are made between the parties. Plaintiff is further advised that Court anticipates the
22 parties to work together in good faith to complete discovery and to resolve any dispute that may
23 arise before turning to the Court.
24

1 While a party may apply to the Court for an order compelling discovery “upon reasonable
2 notice to other parties and all persons affected thereby,” the motion must also include a
3 certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or
4 party failing to make the discovery in an effort to secure the information or material without
5 court intervention.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). In addition, “[a] good faith effort to confer with
6 a party or person not making a disclosure or discovery requires a face-to-face meeting or a
7 telephonic conference.” Local Rule CR 37(a)(2)(A). The Court will not address any motion
8 which lacks such a certification.

9 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

10 (1) Plaintiff’s motion for discovery conference (ECF No. 31) is **Denied as moot**.

11 (2) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.

12 Dated this 14th day of June, 2012.

13
14 

15 Karen L. Strombom
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24